

HONORABLE RICHARD A. JONES

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
AT SEATTLE

PRASANNA SANKARANARAYANAN,

Petitioner,

vs.

DHIVYA SASHIDHAR,

Respondent.

Case No. 24-cv-01745-RAJ

ORDER

THIS MATTER is before the Court on Petitioner's Response to Respondent's Motion to Compel.<sup>1</sup> Dkt. # 43. The Court resolved Respondent's Motion to Compel on December 31, 2024 (the "Order Compelling Discovery"). *See* Dkt. # 40. Petitioner requests that the Court modify its decision in the Order Compelling Discovery. The Court has reviewed Petitioner's Motion, the applicable law, and the balance of the record. The Court affirms its decision in the Order Compelling Discovery with respect to RFP Nos. 10, 22, and 23. The Court STAYS the Order with respect to RFP No. 7.

---


<sup>1</sup> Petitioner's filing is titled "Petitioner's Response to Respondent's Motion to Compel." However, as the Court already resolved the motion by the time the document was filed and asks for amendment or modification of the order, the Court will refer to it as "Petitioner's Motion."

1           Petitioner's arguments regarding the common interest doctrine and Petitioner's  
2 brother acting as an agent are unavailing. The Court is not persuaded that these doctrines  
3 can be stretched to allow attorney-client privilege to protect these communications.  
4 Furthermore, *in camera* review is unfeasible at this stage of the litigation and without any  
5 indication of the number of communications to be reviewed by the Court.

6           The Court stays the Order Compelling Discovery with respect to RFP No. 7. The  
7 Court will rule on RFP No. 7 after a telephone conference. **The Court will hold a**  
8 **telephone conference on January 3, 2025, at 2:00 pm (PST)** to discuss whether the Court  
9 should narrow the scope of discovery of the financial records and documents. If the Court  
10 is convinced that the scope of discovery should be limited, the parties should be prepared  
11 to discuss what constitutes a reasonable limit on the scope of discovery. This telephone  
12 conference shall not disrupt any other discovery in this matter, including the continuance  
13 of Petitioner's deposition discussed in the Order Compelling Discovery.

14           For the reasons state above, the Court will not modify the Order Compelling  
15 Discovery issued on December 31, 2024. Dkt. # 40. The Court STAYS the  
16 Order Compelling Discovery only with respect to RFP No. 7.

17           Dated this 2nd day of January, 2025.

18  
19 

20           The Honorable Richard A. Jones  
21           United States District Judge  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28